Vol. XI, No. 10 HUMAN EVENTS March 10, 1954

RECEIVED MAR 17 1954 LIBRARY

BERLIN: THE REPUBLICAN YALTA

By FREDA UTLEY

TRYING TO FIND OUT, in Berlin, what was really going on at the Berlin Conference was like reading *Pravda* and *Isvestia* with a view to ascertaining the facts behind the verbiage and propaganda.

Outwardly, the Western Foreign Ministers were acting in complete harmony and all of them made some very fine speeches. Molotov, for his part, gave back as good as he got. To judge from appearances, Dulles was leading a united Western front, and neither America, Britain nor France seemed any more disposed to make dirty deals with the Communists than Molotov was to do business with the "capitalist imperialists". In a word, the actors on the stage clearly enunciated their incompatible positions and aims while the audience was left wondering what was going on behind the scenes.

In the corridors of the International Press Center on Potsdammerstrasse, where some 1200 foreign correspondents kicked their heels waiting for the official handouts, at the Maison Francais on Kurfurstendam, where journalists congregated in the evenings, and in other bars, restaurants, and hotel lobbies, rumors and "inside stories" of disagreement in the Western camp and of secret back-stage deals with Moscow made much conversation.

An American friend of mine who is sympathetic to the British viewpoint, told me — when I arrived in Berlin — that he knew from both reliable British and close-to-Eisenhower American sources, that before the conference, under cover of atomic talks, Dulles and the Soviet Ambassador had worked out a compromise in Washington. According to his sources, the U.S. would accept "the fact" that we have no alternative short of war but to recognize the Red Chinese Government. Soviet Russia for her part was to recognize that she had no alternative but to give up East Germany, and permit the reunification of Germany, provided that it was agreed that a united and free Germany was not obligated to join the European Defense Community.

This "inside information" was rendered credible by several facts. There was, in particular, Ambassador Arthur H. Dean's statement on the eve of the Berlin Conference (reported in the *New York Times* on January 23) that we ought to take "a new look" at Red China and "be prepared to admit them to the family of nations" in about two years. And, last December, one of the leading German Social Democratic members of the Bonn Parliament, Fritz Erler, had told me that a "swap" of this nature was the hope and aim of the German Socialists.

Copyright 1954 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In this connection, it was not without significance that German official circles in Bonn complained about High Commissioner Conant speaking mainly, if not only, to the Socialists. On January 25 the Socialist paper, *Hannoversche Presse,* had an article saying that the U.S. was now cooler toward Adenauer, and that Washington had shown an "obvious intention" to strengthen United States' ties with his opposition, the German socialists.

At the beginning of the conference there were two positive factors: (1) Dulles' rejection of Soviet Russia's proposal for a Five Power conference; and (2) Molotov's demonstration that the Kremlin had no intention of relinquishing its hold over East Germany for any price. These seemed to me to discredit the prophesy of Leon Dennen, reporting for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, to the effect that the Berlin Conference would prove to be the Yalta of the Republican Party. But, when I left Berlin, at the end of the second week of the Conference, my pro-British American friend, who had close contact with White House advisers, assured me the deal had not fallen through, but was only postponed. I did not believe him.

In the final outcome both of us seem to have been proved wrong. Soviet Russia has got her *pro quo* without giving us any *quid.* Molotov had made it clear all along that the Kremlin's main objective in coming to Berlin was agreement on a "Five Power" conference with Red China. This was finally agreed upon. But we failed to win any agreement on either Germany or Austria, which was supposed to be the purpose of the Berlin Conference.

Mr. Dulles' brave little attempt to represent the Berlin Conference as a victory for our side, because we still formally refuse to "recognize" the Red China Government, cannot change the facts. Our agreement to join Soviet Russia in inviting the Red Government to Geneva must encourage the U.N. to consider Red China's admission. There is little doubt that Senator George of Georgia was right in saying that the Soviets got just what they wanted in Berlin.

ONE CAN ONLY wonder what caused Dulles to give way, after his adamant refusal at the beginning even to consider a Five Power Conference with Red China. Perhaps the explanation is to be found in the fact that, as he told a press conference on Sunday, February 7, he had had a two-hour talk (presumably by phone) "with the United States" the day before. Correspondents who were present gathered that this had led to a softening of his attitude on China, for Dulles also said, on that Sunday, he would go along with Bidault on the Far East. And Bidault as early as the Thursday of the first week of the conference had thrown overboard the original Western position that only an agreement on Germany could convince us of Soviet sincerity, by declaring an agreement on Indo-China sufficient. Who in Washington pulled the strings on Dulles?

One had the impression in Berlin that Dulles was another Woodrow Wilson. Undoubtedly, he was sincere in his view of Communist Russia and Communist China as rep-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

presentatives of "evil", but he was no match for his "realistic" French and British colleagues. Moreover, he displayed a lamentable ignorance of the nature and aims of the Soviet Government, as when he stated, in his February 24 radio and television speech, that "we should remain ever watchful for a sign from the Soviet rulers that they realize that freedom is not something to be frightened by, but something to be accepted".

As if the rulers of Russia could be brought to "accept" their own liquidation by giving the Russian people freedom of choice between liberty and slavery!

I do not profess to know what makes Mr. Dulles tick. But, to judge from the type of "advisers" he had in Berlin, one surmises that he was overruled or over-persuaded by Mr. C. D. Jackson, "Chip" Bohlen, Dr. Conant and the other New Deal "Republicans" who surrounded him.

If there was any "victor" at Berlin besides Russia, it was France. Having performed wonderfully at Berlin, by rejecting Moscow's appeals to France to join Russia in keeping down her hereditary enemy Germany, Bidault earned Dulles' gratitude. He was considered to have risked his political neck by his full support of America and E.D.C., although the cynics pointed out that he had in reality nothing to lose, either for himself or his party; everyone knew E.D.C. would never be ratified by the French Parliament. However, his bold, brave words at Berlin, and his apparent readiness to support Dulles at every turn, in the give and take with Molotov, earned him what Paris wants as much as Moscow, namely, negotiations with Russia and Red China for an end to the Indo-China war.

WHISTLING TO KEEP his spirits up, in spite of having been forced, or persuaded, to abandon the bold moral position he originally adopted in Berlin, Mr. Dulles is insisting that — thanks to the Conference — the ratification of E.D.C. (that means German rearmament) has been brought nearer. Both in his report to the Senate and in his radio speech on February 24, as in his press conferences in Berlin, Mr. Dulles insisted that the Soviet "alternatives to Western planning" are so repellent that the free nations of Western Europe, including France, will now recognize the necessity of permitting West Germany to rearm.

Yet, even Dr. Adenauer, who has continued to believe, or hope, against all the evidence, that France can be reconciled with Germany and brought to see reason so that she will stop blocking all plans for European defense, said, after the Conference, that ratification of E.D.C. by France would have to wait until after the Geneva Conference in April. But this conference on Asia, arranged by Molotov, in return for no concessions to the West, will only serve as a further excuse to delay parliamentary debate in France on the E.D.C. treaty. This treaty in fact is no longer believed in or wanted except by Dr. Adenauer and the United States and, maybe, the Dutch.

In a word, the Berlin Conference constituted a resounding defeat for the United States. The British may be satisfied, since they have in fact "won" the solution suggested

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the London *Times,* namely, "regulating the peace on the basis of the continued division of Germany".

THE BERLIN CONFERENCE once again proved the sad truth of the statement frequently made by the late Mayor of Berlin, Dr. Ernst Reuter: "The strength of the Soviets consists of the weakness and ignorance of the West." When I visited his widow in Berlin, she told me that when he was dying she had said, "God help us", and his last words had been: "He must, there is so much more to do." "If Ernst were alive", said Frau Reuter, "he might have been able to instill the necessary courage into the leaders of the West to prevent them from giving in to the Kremlin instead of taking advantage of the opportunity afforded by Soviet Russia's present weakness."

It is, however, doubtful whether even the courageous Mayor of Berlin could have changed the outcome of the Berlin Conference. One could not mix with the veritable army of foreign correspondents in Berlin without realizing that the British and the French would eventually have their way. True, M. Bidault and Mr. Eden made some excellent speeches. True, Mr. Dulles seemed to have put some backbone into the French.

But the odds against the United States adopting a realistic policy were too great. Not even the Germans were in favor of our risking war now in order to obviate the future certainty of war when Moscow is ready. Much less the British, who want peace in our time at any price, or the foolish French whose views were expounded nightly at the Maison Francais to American correspondents by that now ancient bird of ill omen, Genevieve Tabouis: "Our main purpose in Berlin is to prevent the rearmament of Germany." When I asked her whether she did not feel she had been wrong in the past, she exploded: "Wrong, what do you mean? Soviet Russia has never waged any war but a defensive one. It is Germany we have to fear." More significant than the ravings of foolish or positively pro-Communist or "neutralist" French correspondents in Berlin, was the attitude of a large number of American journalists, who longed for the bad old days of our collaboration with Soviet Russia.

The contrast between the "home front" and the front line in the cold war was never more clearly illustrated than in Berlin. The people of that bomb-devastated city, together with the thousands of East German escapees eking out a miserable existence in overcrowded refugee camps, are not afraid of the Russians. They know, as we do not, that the Russian people are the unacknowledged allies of the West, and that it is only our continuing concessions to the Communist tyrants who rule them which prevents the liberation of the world. The people of Berlin and of the Soviet zone are among the few who echo Patrick Henry's words: "Give me liberty or give me death." In the words of their own slogan, "Better a horrible end than horror without end."

Freda Utley, author of the *China Story* (1951), has just returned from Germany where she covered the Berlin Conference.

Additional Copies: 6—1.00; 10—1.50; 50—5.50; 100—10.00; 500—15.00; 1,000—25.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Volume XI, No. 10 Wednesday, March 10, 1954 Washington, D. C.

MAR 22 1954

Behind the McCarthy Crisis: The consensus of opinion among the smart boys in the Capital, in the past 48 hours, is that Senator McCarthy won his battle with Secretary of the Army Stevens. However, a feeling lingers that the Wisconsin Senator was unnecessarily rough in calling General Zwicker "unfit" to wear the U.S. uniform.

Thereby hangs a hitherto untold tale which explains McCarthy's exasperation with the officers and which suggests that the Army had better clean its own house before complaining about affronts to its honor. It is this.

Before General Zwicker took the public stand, he was questioned privately by the Senator behind closed doors — in "executive session", the term used on Capitol Hill. We are informed that Zwicker seemed honest and forthright at this time and apparently was cooperative with the committee. Naturally, McCarthy assumed that the General would continue to be cooperative in the public hearing which was to follow.

Of course, as anyone who has read the text of the open hearing interrogation of Zwicker knows, the Army officer was not "cooperative", but evasive. It is this sequence which is necessary to understand McCarthy's very pardonable exasperation.

But McCarthy did not know, may still not know, what bitter tea the General drank in the intervening time to work such a change in him. Our information from high military quarters is that Zwicker received a written order following his executive hearing not to "tell all" at the public hearing the next day.

Why did "higher authority" muzzle the officer and thus cause his public humiliation? The answer lies in the messy situation in the Department of the Army itself. The pervading influence of New Dealer Anna Rosenberg when she served as War Manpower head in recent years has not entirely dissipated. Furthermore, a sort of purge of higher ranking Army officers has been going on, as we pointed out in our issue of February 10. Colonel Bunker, until recently MacArthur's aide, ten days ago gave a newspaper interview indicating that, in his view, elimination of many officers who have shown too much independence by following MacArthur's point of view, has been proceeding.

We have called attention to a fact, well-known to informed observers here, that former Chief of Staff General Marshall still wields quiet but strong influence on policies and promotions in the Army. Marshall is no friend of MacArthur, and the Marshall policy led to our disaster in the Far East. "Marshall", it is said, "is the biggest Truman-Acheson holdover in the nation's Capital." Those who have a vested interest in their own past mistakes, often work strenuously — and with little regard for the honor of a mere Brigadier General or the respect due a U.S. Senator.

Fight to Go On: When the George amendment was beaten by one vote in the Senate on February 26, millions of citizens waited, tensely, expecting momentarily that Senator Bricker would issue a strong statement that the fight would go on. Nearly a week passed and perturbation spread. Then, on March 4, they heard the words they wanted to hear — and more besides. In Atlanta, Senator Bricker said the fight to protect the Constitution from the plots of internationalists to destroy it "has only just begun". He also declared that "the American people would never let the issue die".

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1954 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bricker then did some straight-from-the-shoulder talking about the tactics of the White House in defeating the George amendment. Observers know that it was under Roosevelt that the White House lobby (armed with patronage) became a powerful weapon for whipping Congress into line — a weapon violative of the spirit of the Constitution which presumed that one branch of the government would not pressure another. Bricker pointed out that while the Administration took the view that both his amendment and that of George "breached the traditional line of demarcation between legislative and executive powers", the real breach of that line occurred "in the buttonholing of Senators by high officials of the White House and State Department".

Meanwhile on Capitol Hill both sides are jockeying for position as the Senate prepares to reconsider the George amendment. The situation is still highly critical, but mounting pressure by home folks on opposition Senators — both Democrats and Republicans — may produce a switch for victory.

Not Merely Gossip: Capital observers this week turned attention to what they call the "mystery of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.", head of our delegation to UN. The comparative quiet of that gentleman and the lack of publicity (of which he has never before been shy) makes old hands wonder a bit. When the UN session closed up in January, Lodge was slated to become quite a figure in Washington and various capitals, with no little to say publicly and privately. True, he may be silently maneuvering to appear ere long as the top psychological warfare adviser to Ike — to succeed C. D. Jackson. Or, he may mysteriously and quietly retire — not unlike the sudden and unexplained retirement of Arthur Vandenberg, Jr. (son of the late Senator), who came to Washington a year ago to take a White House job, with quite a big bang, but who has subsequently disappeared from the political scene.

● Not all the forensics of the current McCarthy *contra mundum* are what they seem to be when reported to the press. National GOP Chairman Len Hall, for instance, (who is usually regarded as very friendly to the Wisconsin Senator) rapped Senator Joe over the wrist at one juncture of the fray, thus causing much surprise. Just before he did so, we learned that Hall was seeking to pass the word, via a grapevine to Joe, that the latter should not take seriously a coming "slap-on-the-wrist", that Hall would have to make it at the request of the White House.

● It happened at the Burning Tree golf club outside Washington where President Eisenhower plays. Ike, who was seated at luncheon with Senator Prescott Bush, asked: "I wonder why Robert R. Young wants so badly to get into that New York Central Railway?" Senator Bush, a former partner in Harriman and Company, one of the Wall Street investment banking crowd which has fought Young, remarked: "A lot of people in the railway business don't like Young." The President said: "Well, the opposition to Young sent a fellow to see me and he asked me to intervene in the matter [inferentially with the Interstate Commerce Commission]. I refused to do so." Since the President seemed pretty final about that, the conversation turned to golf.

● In the Senate cloakrooms, they are calling their Vermont colleague "Senator Slanders". For the smear attack of Senator Ralph E. Flanders, junior Senator from Vermont, on Senator McCarthy, is not appreciated by regular Republicans, who see in it an appeasement of the Democratic Party, now in its grand effort to split the GOP.

The McLeod Case: The State Department took a step last week which, if they follow it up, will mean complete recapture of State by the "old gang" of Fair Dealers and Acheson friends — and it will prove one of the most serious blows to the country since Ike took power a year ago. By this time, the average businessman must be aware that State — through its power to spend abroad and shape our foreign policy — is infinitely more important (and dangerous) to the business community than the Department of Commerce. Hence the importance of the McLeod case.

What State did last week was to announce that Mr. Scott McLeod, Administrator of Security, should be shorn of his authority over his Personnel bureau (that is his power to "hire and fire"), leaving to him only his investigative powers. McLeod, despite opposition from Undersecretary "Beedle" Smith and the old gang, has valiantly sought (and with some measure of success) to clean out "security risks". He has thereby incurred the deadly enmity of the "old gang". The "gang" is by no means old in age;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they are mostly young men who climbed to power in the latter days of Roosevelt and under Truman and Acheson. This crowd wants no cleanout, unless it means exclusion of the minority of truly American diplomats who put national security above adherence to the old Truman-Acheson policies.

Hence, with infinite care and planning, the old crowd prepared the way for McLeod's downfall. Their friends in the press and on the air, the "liberals", went to work to smear McLeod over a period of weeks (hence the hullabaloo over his speeches at Lincoln Day dinners). The planners timed the major operation for a week when Secretary Dulles was abroad and when McLeod was away on vacation. Then they released the news that McLeod had been separated from his "hire and fire" bureau.

McCarthy called for an explanation from Dulles about this shenanigan. Eisenhower said it was none of the business of members of Congress. McCarthy could have, but refrained from doing so, retorted that the Committee on Executive Expenditures (of which he is Chairman) has not only the right but the duty to look into such matters. Meanwhile, in the past forty-eight hours, Senator Styles Bridges, head of the Appropriations Committee which has power over State Department funds, arrived back in town from a European trip. What will he say and do?

The stage is set for a big row between the Executive and Legislative branches over the McLeod affair. Observers believe that, unless the Legislative branch makes the State Department retreat on the McLeod case, the game is lost for those who expected a real cleanout of the State Department. And that means more and more predominance of the old Truman-Acheson coterie. The matter is crucial.

Memory at Caracas: Secretary Dulles' sudden appeal for inter-American collaboration against Communism undoubtedly provoked some bitter memories among Latin-American diplomats. For they know that it was Franklin D. Roosevelt who opened wide the door for Communist penetration of the peoples south of the Rio Grande. Here is the story.

Immediately after World War I the Kremlin plotters put Latin America high on their list and sent in Communist agents masquerading as merchants, journalists, etc. The subversives spread out in Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, Mexico and other places, organizing Communist cells and uprisings. Then the Latin Americans woke up. They found out that Moscow had actually designated one of the Russian traders as "Commissar for South America"; that he was operating under a hundred-page blueprint directive for softening up the Latins for revolution. The so-called Russian traders and agents were booted out. But the important fact is that from 1919-33 Latin American countries had a bitter experience with Communist Russia. Time and again Russian agents came close to capturing a whole country through inspired strikes and violents riots. They were defeated only by the determined efforts of anti-Communist leaders who often found out just in the nick of time about a plot on the verge of success. By 1933 Latin America was thoroughly aroused to the world revolutionary activities of the Kremlin.

Then up in Washington Roosevelt did something that left the anti-Communist leaders to our South gasping. Roosevelt had been President only a few months when one South American ambassador found out negotiations were under way for the U.S. to recognize Soviet Russia. In no time at all Latin American governments were burning up the cables with documented warnings to Roosevelt, "don't do it". They knew that recognition of Russia by the U.S. would give Communism a powerful foothold in this part of the world and the opportunity to renew on a formidable scale its infiltrative activities, in the countries to our south. Four Presidents of the U.S. had refused to recognize Red Russia because they knew that recognition would be an effective instrument for infiltrating America. The American Legion's official publication has charged that the messages from Latin American countries warning Roosevelt not to give Russia recognition were stamped "top secret" and hidden from Congress and the people.

But Roosevelt recognized Russia one midnight over the prayerful protests of the American Federation of Labor and the American Legion and other powerful groups. The Communists promptly set up a big Embassy in Washington and from this base operations started in again to infiltrate Latin America, and later during World War II put pressure on Latin American governments to recognize Soviet Russia. All this explains why Dulles did not have such a big success at Caracas last week as was reported.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Four-cent Stamp: H.R. 6052 has been passed by the House Post Office Committee. If it clears both houses of Congress, in its present form, you will have to put a four-cent stamp on your first-class love letters if you want them to reach their destination.

The reason for the hike? The annual deficit. Ever since the post office business became a government monopoly (it wasn't so in the beginning) it has come up with an annual deficit, and every increase in postal rates, peculiarly enough, was followed by a greater deficit than the Department showed before; and that was so even though the volume of its business increased. We can predict with some confidence that this new increase in postage rates, when it goes into effect, will produce a deficit larger than the last one. Why?

One reason we offer is the practice of the Department of buying services at a price determined by availability, not use. Most of the delivery operations of the Post Office Department are performed by private carriers: railroads, airplanes, ships, motor trucks. The Department does not pay for the services actually rendered by these carriers, but for the availability of their services. Thus, a mail car is paid for at the rate agreed upon, which is for so many pounds for so many miles, even if it carries only a fraction of the mail it is supposed to carry, according to contract. This is the way the government, since it monopolized the post office business, has always subsidized carriers. These subsidies play a big part in creating the annual deficits, but the books of the Department are not kept in such a way as to show up the subsidies. This is the secret and swollen item which has been kept from the knowledge of the taxpayer.

A recent news item underlines the point. The Department announced a few weeks ago that it would transport by air between certain cities, if the airplanes had room for mail that had been sent at regular first-class rates. The Post Office owned the space, as per contract. However, that meant that the railroads would have that much less mail to carry. Would the railroads make a refund for the services they were not called upon to render, because the mail was transferred from their cars to the airplanes? Don't be foolish. (We are told that the railroads have complained that this taking mail from them is discriminatory.)

Perhaps you would call this way of subsidizing carriers an inefficient way of running the post office. But, why should anyone expect efficiency in a government department? The Post Office is no more a business than is the War Department or the State Department, and no one applies to these agencies the standards of efficiency that are applicable to a business. We will never have efficiency in the service of delivering mail — and we will never get rid of deficits — until the Post Office is turned over to private enterprise.

Scared Cats: One-Worlder Robert M. Hutchins says, in an article in *Look* (March 9), that teachers are actually afraid to teach, not arithmetic, reading and spelling, but UN, One-World, UNESCO. They are afraid to even mention these topics, because doing so might cost them their reputations if not their jobs. This is interesting, if true. The former President of the University of Chicago says in his article that he bases his conclusions on a study made by the National Education Association, an organization that has been flooding schools and the country with One-World and UNESCO propaganda for some time.

We hesitate to describe so eminent an educator as naive. But we have before us a manual issued by the Board of Education of New York; this manual is issued to teachers whose subject is Social Studies. It is replete with instructions on how to interest children in One-Worldism, UNESCO, UN. Now, how can teachers be afraid to teach what they are instructed to teach by the school authorities? We would assume that they would be fired if they did not follow orders — if, for instance, they pointed out the inherent deficiencies of One-Worldism.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED